arXiv:1703.06371v1 [cs.SY] 19 Mar 2017

A Semi-Definite Programming Approach to Stability Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Equations

Aditya Gahlawat[1] and Giorgio Valmorbida[2]

***Abstract*— We consider the stability analysis of a large class of linear 1-D PDEs with polynomial data. This class of PDEs contains, as examples, parabolic and hyperbolic PDEs, PDEs with boundary feedback and systems of in-domain/boundary coupled PDEs. Our approach is Lyapunov based which allows us to reduce the stability problem to the verification of integral inequalities on the subspaces of Hilbert spaces. Then, using fundamental theorem of calculus and Green's theorem, we construct a polynomial problem to verify the integral inequalities. Constraining the solution of the polynomial problem to belong to the set of sum-of-squares polynomials subject to affine constraints allows us to use semi-definite programming to algorithmically construct Lyapunov certificates of stability for the systems under consideration. We also provide numerical results of the application of the proposed method on different types of PDEs.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Temporal evolution of processes involving spatially distributed physical quantities require Partial Differential Equations (PDEs) to produce accurate models for analysis and control [18], [2]. Analysis of PDE systems brings forth technical challenges relative to Ordinary Differential Equations (ODEs) due to the infinite dimensional nature of the state-space. Owing to the maturity of research on ODEs, a traditional method of analysis is to reduce PDE systems, using spatial or spectral methods, to a system of ODEs which can then be analyzed with relative ease [5], [7].

Recently, various *direct methods*, i.e., methods without finite-dimensional approximation, have been developed for analysis and control of PDEs. For controller synthesis, backstepping is an oft used method wherein the problem of stabilizing boundary feedback design is reduced to a hyperbolic PDE whose solution can be obtained either analytically or numerically [8]. Similarly, one may use Lyapunov's second method for infinite-dimensional systems to establish stability [3], [10]. The Lyapunov's method requires that the structure of a Lyapunov Functional (LF) be chosen a priori. In the presented work, we choose quadratic LF candidates of the form as used in our previous work in [6]. The reason for this choice, as we established in [6], is that such LF candidates are accurate in providing stability certificates for parabolic PDEs. Additionally, also in [6], we showed that such LFs are certificates of stability for parabolic PDEs actuated by backstepping boundary feedback.

The LF candidates we consider lead to Lyapunov inequalities defined by integral expressions containing quadratic terms in the state defined on the interval $[0,1]$ and its boundaries, and the sets in variables x and y defined by the inequalities $0 \leq y \leq x \leq 1$, $0 \leq x \leq y \leq 1$, and their boundaries. Moreover, the verification of these inequalities have to performed on the subspaces defined by the boundary conditions of the PDE whose stability we wish to established. The interplay between the 2-D domain/1-D domain and the boundary values have to be thus accounted for with Fundamental Theorem of Calculus (FTC) and Green's theorem, which are used in a similar way to [15].

[1]Aditya Gahlawat is with the Department of Mechanical, Materials and Aerospace Engineering (MMAE), Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, IL-60616, USA agahlawa@hawk.iit.edu

[2]Giorgio Valmorbida is an associate professor at Laboratoire des Signaux et Systèmes, CentraleSupélec, CNRS, Univ. Paris-Sud, Université Paris-Saclay, 3 Rue Joliot Curie, Gif-sur-Yvette 91192, France giorgio.valmorbida@l2s.centralesupelec.fr

A. Contribution

The paper presents a convex numerical formulation for the verification of integral inequalities on (subspaces of) Hilbert spaces and apply it to stability analysis of PDE systems with polynomial data. The proposed method contains previous approaches by the authors, see, for e.g. [6], [16], thus encompassing a larger class of PDEs.

In order to accomplish our goals we first reduce the problem of stability analysis to the verification of a couple of integral inequalities on (subspaces of) Hilbert spaces. To verify these inequalities, we use FTC and Green's theorem to construct polynomial equations whose solution, if exists, verifies the Lyapunov integral inequalities. Finally, we show that this polynomial equation may be solved by searching for Sum-of-Squares (SOS) polynomials under affine constraints thus rendering the problem of searching for the solution as a Semi-Definite Program (SDP) [1, Chapter 3], [17], a convex optimization problem.

B. Outline

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II we present the problem statement and formulate the stability analysis problem as the problem of verification of a couple of integral inequalities. In Section III we present a class of non-negative/positive integral inequalities on Hilbert spaces constructed using positive semi-definite polynomial matrices. In Section IV we use FTC and Green's theorem to construct slack integrals. Finally, in Section V we present the main result and numerical experiments.

C. Notation

We denote by $\overline{\Omega}$ the set $\{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 \leq y \leq x \leq 1\}$, $\underline{\Omega} = \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 \leq x \leq y \leq 1\}$ and $\Delta = [0,1] \times [0,1]$. In the following definitions $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}$. For $w : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^\beta$, $w \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0,1])$, we denote by $\partial_x^i w(x)$ the i-th derivative of w and

$$w_\alpha(x) = \begin{bmatrix} w(x)^T & \partial_x w(x)^T & \cdots & \partial_x^\alpha w(x)^T \end{bmatrix}^T,$$
$$w_\alpha^b = \begin{bmatrix} w_{\alpha-1}(1)^T w_{\alpha-1}(0)^T \end{bmatrix}^T, \quad \bar{w}_\alpha(x) = [w_\alpha(x)^T w_\alpha^b].$$

Thus, $w_\alpha : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^{\beta(\alpha+1)}$, $w_\alpha^b \in \mathbb{R}^{2\beta\alpha}$ and $\bar{w}_\alpha : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^{\beta(3\alpha+1)}$. We denote by $N_\partial, N \in \mathbb{N}^{\beta\alpha \times \beta(\alpha+1)}$ and $N_0, N_1 \in \mathbb{N}^{\beta\alpha \times 2\beta\alpha}$ the matrices satisfying

$$\partial_x w_{\alpha-1}(x) = N_\partial w_\alpha(x), \quad w_{\alpha-1}(x) = N w_\alpha(x),$$
$$w_{\alpha-1}(0) = N_0 w_\alpha^b, \qquad w_{\alpha-1}(1) = N_1 w_\alpha^b.$$

We denote

$$\mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1]) = \Big\{ w(x) \in \mathbb{R}^\beta \ : w, \partial_x w, \ldots, \partial_x^{\alpha-1} w \text{ are absolutely continuous on } [0,1] \text{ and}$$

$$\int_0^1 \left(\partial_x^\alpha w(x)\right)^T \left(\partial_x^\alpha w(x)\right) dx < \infty \Big\}.$$

We also write $\mathcal{L}_2([0,1]) = \mathcal{H}^0([0,1])$. The space $\mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1])$ is endowed with the standard inner product and norm

$$\|w\|_{\mathcal{H}^\alpha} = \sqrt{\langle w_\alpha, w_\alpha \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^\alpha}} = \sqrt{\int_0^1 w_\alpha(x)^T w_\alpha(x) dx},$$

and the space $\mathcal{L}_2([0,1])$ has the norm and inner product $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} = \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}$ and $\langle \cdot,\cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{L}_2} = \langle \cdot,\cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0}$, respectively.

For any $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $0_{m,n}$ the matrix of zeros of dimensions m-by-n and 0_m when $m = n$. Similarly, we denote by I_n the identity matrix of dimensions n-by-n. For any square matrix Q, we denote $He(Q) = \frac{1}{2}\left(Q + Q^T\right)$.

We denote by $\mathcal{S}^n[x]$ and $\mathcal{S}^n[(x,y)]$ the sets of symmetric polynomial matrices of size n-by-n in variables x, and x and y, respectively. Similarly, we denote by $\mathcal{R}^{m\times n}[x]$ and $\mathcal{R}^{m\times n}[(x,y)]$ the sets of real polynomial matrices of size m-by-n in variables x and y. We denote by $\Sigma^n[x] : [0,1] \to \mathbb{S}^n$ the set of Sum-of-Squares (SOS) polynomials in the variable x. Note that, by definition, an SOS polynomial is non-negative for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ [1]. We say that a polynomial $S \in \mathcal{S}^n[x]$ is positive semi-definite on $[0,1]$ if $S(x) \succeq 0$, for all $x \in [0,1]$. Given $\alpha, \beta, d \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$Y_{q(\alpha,\beta,d)}(x,y) = I_{\beta(\alpha+1)} \otimes z(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{q(\alpha,\beta,d)\times\beta(\alpha+1)}, \quad (1)$$

where $q(\alpha,\beta,d) = \frac{1}{2}\beta(\alpha+1)(d+2)(d+1)$, $z(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{\frac{1}{2}(d+2)(d+1)}$ is the vector of monomials in x and y up to degree d and $\otimes$ denotes the Kronecker product.

For any bivariate function $K : \overline{\Omega} \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, we define the linear map

$$\Gamma[K] = \begin{cases} K(x,y), & x \geq y \\ K(y,x)^T, & y > x \end{cases},$$

thus satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Delta v(x)^T \Gamma[K] v(y) d\Delta \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^x v(x)^T K(x,y) v(y) dy dx \\ &+ \int_0^1 \int_x^1 v(x)^T K(y,x)^T v(y) dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Consider the following class of linear PDEs

$$\partial_t w(x,t) = A(x) w_\alpha(x,t), \quad (2a)$$

where $A \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta\times\beta(\alpha+1)}[x]$. The state $w : [0,1]\times[0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^\beta$ belongs to the set of boundary conditions $\mathcal{B}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B} = \Big\{ & w \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1]) : \\ & \int_0^1 \begin{bmatrix} F_1(x) & F_2 \end{bmatrix} \bar{w}_\alpha(x) dx = 0_{\beta\alpha,1} \Big\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2b)$$

where $F_1 \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta\alpha\times\beta(\alpha+1)}[x]$ and $F_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\beta\alpha\times 2\beta\alpha}$. We now provide a few examples of PDEs which can be cast in the from of (2). Each of the following PDEs is parameterized by a positive scalar λ.

1) Example 1*:* Consider the following **parabolic PDE with distributed coefficients and boundary feedback**

$$\partial_t v(x,t) = \left(x^2+1\right)\partial_x^2 v(x,t) + 0.5x\partial_x v(x,t) + \lambda v(x,t), \quad (3a)$$

$$v(0,t) = 0, \quad \int_0^1 \left(x^2 - x\right) v(x,t) dx - \partial_x v(1,t) = 0. \quad (3b)$$

This PDE may be set in the form of (2) with $\alpha = 2, \beta = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} w(x,t) =& v(x,t), \\ A(x) =& \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 0.5x & x^2+1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad F_1(x) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x^2 - x & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ F_2 =& \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

2) Example 2*:* Now consider the following **system of hyperbolic PDEs coupled in-domain and at the boundaries**

$$\partial_t v_1(x,t) = (\lambda - 1)\left(x^2+1\right)\partial_x v_1(x,t) + (x-3)v_2(x,t), \quad (4a)$$

$$\partial_t v_2(x,t) = (x+1)\partial_x v_2(x,t), \quad (4b)$$

$$v_1(0,t) - 3v_2(0,t) = 0, \quad v_2(1,t) = 0. \quad (4c)$$

This PDE may be set in the form of (2) with $\alpha = 1, \beta = 2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} w(x,t) =& \begin{bmatrix} v_1(x,t) & v_2(x,t) \end{bmatrix}^T, \\ A(x) =& \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x-3 & (\lambda-1)\left(x^2+1\right) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & x+1 \end{bmatrix}, \\ F_1(x) =& 0_{\beta\alpha,\beta(\alpha+1)}, \quad F_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & -3 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

3) Example 3*:* Finally, consider the following **Euler-Bernoulli beam model**

$$\partial_t^2 v(x,t) + \partial_x^4 v(x,t) = 0, \quad (5a)$$

$$\partial_x^2 v(0,t) - \frac{1}{1-\lambda}\partial_{xt} v(0,t) = 0, \quad (5b)$$

$$\partial_x^3 v(0,t) + (1-\lambda)\partial_t v(0,t) = 0, \quad \partial_x^2 v(1,t) = 0, \quad (5c)$$

$$v(1,t) = 0. \quad (5d)$$

We may re-write (5) as

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t \begin{bmatrix} \partial_x^2 v(x,t) \\ \partial_t v(x,t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \partial_x^2 \partial_t v(x,t) \\ -\partial_x^4 v(x,t) \end{bmatrix}, \\ &\partial_x^2 v(0,t) - \frac{1}{1-\lambda}\partial_{xt} v(0,t) = 0, \\ &\partial_x^3 v(0,t) + (1-\lambda)\partial_t v(0,t) = 0, \quad \partial_x^2 v(1,t) = 0, \\ &\partial_t v(1,t) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

With this representation, we may write (5) in the form of (2) with $\alpha = 2, \beta = 2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} w(x,t) =& \begin{bmatrix} \partial_x^2 v(x,t) & \partial_t v(x,t) \end{bmatrix}^T, \\ A(x) =& \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad F_1(x) = 0_{\beta\alpha,\beta(\alpha+1)}, \\ F_2 =& \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{1-\lambda} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1-\lambda & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We wish to establish the stability of systems under consideration by constructing Lyapunov functional (LF) certificates of exponential stability. In particular, we wish to construct LFs of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(w) =& \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 w(x,t)^T T_b(x) w(x,t) dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\int_\Delta w(x,t)^T \Gamma\left[\bar{T}\right] w(y,t) d\Delta, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $T_b \in \mathcal{S}^\beta[x]$ and $\bar{T} \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta\times\beta}[(x,y)]$. As stated in the introduction, LFs of the form (6) are stability certificates for parabolic PDE systems with boundary backstepping based control

laws [6]. The numerical results in [6] also indicate that such LFs are not conservative for spatially distributed scalar parabolic PDEs.

Let us now formulate the exponential stability conditions for (2). We begin by computing the time derivative of (6) along the trajectories of (2). Consider a scalar $\delta > 0$ and define

$$\mathcal{V}_d(w) = -\partial_t \mathcal{V}(w) - 2\delta \mathcal{V}(w), \tag{7}$$

which can be put in the form (see the Appendix)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V}_d(w) = &\int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T U_b(x) \bar{w}_\alpha(x) dx \\ &+ \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T \Gamma \left[\bar{U}\right] w_\alpha(y) d\Delta, \quad w \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1]), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} U_b(x) = &- He\left(\begin{bmatrix} T_b(x)A(x) & 0_{\beta,2\beta\alpha} \\ 0_{3\beta\alpha,\beta(\alpha+1)} & 0_{3\beta\alpha,2\beta\alpha}\end{bmatrix}\right) \\ &- He\left(\begin{bmatrix} \delta T_b(x) & 0_{\beta,3\beta\alpha} \\ 0_{3\beta\alpha,\beta} & 0_{3\beta\alpha}\end{bmatrix}\right), \\ \bar{U}(x,y) = &- \frac{1}{2}\left(\begin{bmatrix}\bar{T}(x,y)^T A(x)\end{bmatrix}^T + \begin{bmatrix}\bar{T}(x,y)A(y)\end{bmatrix}\right) \\ &- \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 2\delta\bar{T}(x,y) & 0_{\beta,\beta\alpha} \\ 0_{\beta\alpha,\beta} & 0_{\beta\alpha}\end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

The following theorem casts the verification of exponential stability of (2) as the verification of two integral inequalities.

Theorem 1: Given the PDE (2) suppose there exist positive scalars μ, δ and polynomial matrices $T_b \in \mathcal{S}^\beta[x]$ and $\bar{T} \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta\times\beta}[(x,y)]$ such that

$$\mathcal{V}(w) \geq \mu \|w\|^2_{\mathcal{L}_2}, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{L}_2([0,1]), \tag{9}$$

$$\mathcal{V}_d(w) \geq 0, \qquad \forall w \in \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1]), \tag{10}$$

where $\mathcal{V}(w)$ and $\mathcal{V}_d(w)$ are defined in (6) and (8), respectively.

Then, there exists a positive scalar κ such that the solution of (2) satisfies

$$\|w(\cdot,t)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} \leq \kappa e^{-\delta t}\|w(\cdot,0)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \tag{11}$$

Proof: Let us choose the LF candidate $\mathcal{V}(w)$. Since the condition in (9) holds, we have that there exists a positive scalar θ such that

$$\mu\|w(\cdot,t)\|^2_{\mathcal{L}_2} \leq \mathcal{V}(w) \leq \theta \|w(\cdot,t)\|^2_{\mathcal{L}_2}, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \tag{12}$$

where the upper bound is a consequence of T_b and $\bar{T}$ being polynomial matrices defined on bounded domains.

Now, for this LF candidate, we have from (7)-(8) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V}_d(w) = &- \partial_t \mathcal{V}(w) - 2\delta\mathcal{V}(w) \\ = &\int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x,t)^T U_b(x) \bar{w}_\alpha(x,t) dx \\ &+ \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x,t)^T \Gamma\left[\bar{U}\right] w_\alpha(y,t) d\Delta, \end{aligned}$$

and since the condition in (10) holds, we have that

$$-\partial_t \mathcal{V}(w) - 2\delta\mathcal{V}(w) \geq 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \tag{13}$$

Integrating this expression in time produces

$$\mathcal{V}(w) \leq e^{-2\delta t}\mathcal{V}(w(0)).$$

Using (12) produces

$$\mu\|w(\cdot,t)\|^2_{\mathcal{L}_2} \leq e^{-2\delta t}\theta\|w(\cdot,0)\|^2_{\mathcal{L}_2}.$$

Then, taking the square root we conclude that (11) holds with $\kappa = \sqrt{\theta/\mu}$. ∎

We have reduced the problem of stability analysis of (2) to the verification of the integral inequalities in (9) and (10). Thus, the remainder of the work considers the following problem:

Problem: Verify if $\mathcal{V}(w)$ is strictly positive on $\mathcal{L}_2([0,1])$ and $\mathcal{V}_d(w)$ is non-negative on $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1])$.

We verify (9) by generalizing the methods proposed in [6] and [16]. Namely, we test the positive semi-definiteness of a polynomial matrix associated to T_b and $\bar{T}$. Since (10) requires $\mathcal{V}_d(w) \geq 0$ only on the subset $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1])$, it calls for a different formulation than the one adopted to verify (9). In this case we first construct a set of integral terms $\mathcal{S}(w)$ which have the same structure as $\mathcal{V}_d(w)$ and satisfy $\mathcal{S}(w) = 0$, for all $w \in \mathcal{B}$. We refer to such expressions as *slack integrals*. We then check for the positive semi-definiteness of a polynomial matrix associated to $\mathcal{V}_d(w) + \mathcal{S}(w)$ which guarantees $\mathcal{V}_d(w) + \mathcal{S}(w) \geq 0$, for all $w \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1])$.

The construction of the desired slack integrals is presented in Section IV. These integrals generalize the results presented in [11], [12] for time-delay systems and in [16] for PDE analysis using (6) with $\bar{T} = 0$.

III. POSITIVE/NON-NEGATIVE INTEGRAL INEQUALITIES ON HILBERT SPACES

In this section we construct a set of positive/non-negative integral inequalities which are parameterized by Positive Semi-Definite (PSD) polynomial matrices. The results provided are a generalization of [6, Theorem 1]. Throughout this section we will use the polynomial matrix $Y_{q(\alpha,\beta,d)}(x,y)$ defined in (1) in Section I-C.

We begin by constructing non-negative integral inequalities on $\mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1])$, given $\alpha, d \in \mathbb{N}$, which have the same form as $\mathcal{V}_d(w)$ in (8). Let us define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}(w) = &\int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T R_b(x) \bar{w}_\alpha(x) dx \\ &+ \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T \Gamma\left[\bar{R}\right] w_\alpha(y) d\Delta, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where $R_b \in \mathcal{S}^{\beta(3\alpha+1)}[x]$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{R}(x,y) = &R_{12}(x)Y_{q(\alpha,\beta,d)}(x,y) + Y_{q(\alpha,\beta,d)}(y,x)^T R_{13}(y)^T \\ &+ \int_0^y Y_{q(\alpha,\beta,d)}(z,x)^T R_{33} Y_{q(\alpha,\beta,d)}(z,y) dz \\ &+ \int_y^x Y_{q(\alpha,\beta,d)}(z,x)^T R_{23}^T Y_{q(\alpha,\beta,d)}(z,y) dz \\ &+ \int_x^1 Y_{q(\alpha,\beta,d)}(z,x)^T R_{22} Y_{q(\alpha,\beta,d)}(z,x) dz. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

for some (polynomial) matrices $R_{12}, R_{13} \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta(\alpha+1)\times q(\alpha,\beta,d)}[x]$, $R_{22}, R_{33} \in \mathbb{S}^{q(\alpha,\beta,d)}$ and $R_{23} \in \mathbb{R}^{q(\alpha,\beta,d)\times q(\alpha,\beta,d)}$, which also define

$$\begin{aligned} R(x) = &\left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} R_b(x) & \begin{bmatrix} R_{12}(x) \\ 0_{2\beta\alpha,q(\alpha,\beta,d)}\end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} R_{13}(x) \\ 0_{2\beta\alpha,q(\alpha,\beta,d)}\end{bmatrix} \\ \hline \begin{bmatrix} R_{12}(x) \\ 0_{2\beta\alpha,q(\alpha,\beta,d)}\end{bmatrix}^T & R_{22} & R_{23} \\ \hline \begin{bmatrix} R_{13}(x) \\ 0_{2\beta\alpha,q(\alpha,\beta,d)}\end{bmatrix}^T & R_{23}^T & R_{33}\end{array}\right] \\ &\in \mathcal{S}^{\beta(3\alpha+1)+2q(\alpha,\beta,d)}[x]. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The following theorem states the conditions on the polynomial matrix $R(x)$ whose submatrices define R_b and $\bar{R}$ such that (14) is non-negative on $\mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1])$.

Theorem 2: Given (polynomial) matrices which define $\mathcal{R}(w)$ in (14), if

$$R(x) \succeq 0, \quad \forall x \in [0,1], \tag{17}$$

where $R(x)$ is defined in (16), then

$$\mathcal{R}(w) \geq 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{H}^{\alpha}([0,1]). \tag{18}$$

Proof: Throughout this proof, for notational brevity, we write q in place of $q(\alpha,\beta,d)$.

If we define

$$f(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{w}_\alpha(x) \\ \int_0^x Y_q(x,y)w_\alpha(y)dy \\ \int_x^1 Y_q(x,y)w_\alpha(y)dy \end{bmatrix}, \quad w \in \mathcal{H}^{\alpha}([0,1]),$$

then

$$\int_0^1 f(x)^T R(x) f(x) dx \geq 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{H}^{\alpha}([0,1]), \tag{19}$$

since $R(x) \succeq 0$, for all $x \in [0,1]$. Simplifying the expression we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^1 f(x)^T R(x) f(x) dx \\ &= \int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T R_b(x) \bar{w}_\alpha(x) dx + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \Theta_i, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_1 =& 2\int_0^1 \int_0^x w_\alpha(x)^T R_{12}(x) Y_q(x,y) w_\alpha(y) dy dx \\ &+ 2\int_0^1 \int_x^1 w_\alpha(x)^T R_{13}(x) Y_q(x,y) w_\alpha(y) dy dx, \\ \Theta_2 =& \int_0^1 \left(\int_0^x Y_q(x,y) w_\alpha(y) dy \right)^T \\ &\times \left(\int_0^x R_{22} Y_q(x,y) w_\alpha(y) dy \right. \\ &\qquad \left. + \int_x^1 R_{23} Y_q(x,y) w_\alpha(y) dy \right) dx, \\ \Theta_3 =& \int_0^1 \left(\int_x^1 Y_q(x,y) w_\alpha(y) dy \right)^T \\ &\times \left(\int_0^x R_{23}^T Y_q(x,y) w_\alpha(y) dy \right. \\ &\qquad \left. + \int_x^1 R_{33} Y_q(x,y) w_\alpha(y) dy \right) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma A.1 to Θ_1 with $K_1(x,y) = 2R_{12}(x)Y_q(x,y)$ and $K_2(x,y) = 2R_{13}(x)Y_q(x,y)$ produces

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_1 =& \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T \Gamma \left[R_{12}(x) Y_q(x,y) \right] w_\alpha(y) d\Delta \\ &+ \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T \Gamma \left[Y_q(y,x)^T R_{13}(y)^T \right] w_\alpha(y) d\Delta, \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Applying Lemma A.2 to Θ_2 with

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(x,y) =& Y_q(x,y), \quad F_2(x,y) = 0_{q,\beta(\alpha+1)}, \quad v(y) = w_\alpha(y), \\ G_1(x,y) =& R_{22} Y_q(x,y), \quad G_2(x,y) = R_{23} Y_q(x,y), \end{aligned}$$

produces

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_2 =& \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T \Gamma \left[\int_y^x Y_q(z,x)^T \frac{R_{23}^T}{2} Y_q(z,y) dz \right] w_\alpha(y) d\Delta, \\ &+ \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T \Gamma \left[\int_x^1 Y_q(z,x)^T R_{22} Y_q(z,y) dz \right] w_\alpha(y) d\Delta. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Similarly, applying Lemma A.2 to Θ_3 with

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(x,y) =& 0_{q,\beta(\alpha+1)}, \quad F_2(x,y) = Y_q(x,y), \quad v(y) = w_\alpha(y), \\ G_1(x,y) =& R_{23}^T Y_q(x,y), \quad G_2(x,y) = R_{33} Y_q(x,y), \end{aligned}$$

produces

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_3 =& \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T \Gamma \left[\int_0^y Y_q(z,x)^T R_{33}^T Y_q(z,y) dz \right] w_\alpha(y) d\Delta, \\ &+ \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T \Gamma \left[\int_y^x Y_q(z,x)^T \frac{R_{23}^T}{2} Y_q(z,y) dz \right] w_\alpha(y) d\Delta. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Substituting (21)-(23) into (20) produces

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 f(x)^T R(x) f(x) dx =& \int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T R_b(x) \bar{w}_\alpha(x) dx \\ &+ \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T \Gamma \left[\bar{R} \right] w_\alpha(y) d\Delta \end{aligned}$$

Then, (19) completes the proof. ∎

We now present a corollary in which we construct strictly positive integral inequalities on $\mathcal{L}_2([0,1])$ which have the same form as $\mathcal{V}(w)$ in (6). This corollary corresponds to $\alpha = 0$ in Theorem 2.

Given $w \in \mathcal{L}_2([0,1])$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$, let us define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}(w) =& \int_0^1 w(x)^T T_b(x) w(x) dx \\ &+ \int_\Delta w(x)^T \Gamma \left[\bar{T} \right] w(y) d\Delta, \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where $T_b \in \mathcal{S}^{\beta}[x]$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{T}(x,y) =& T_{12}(x) Y_{q(0,\beta,d)}(x,y) + Y_{q(0,\beta,d)}(y,x)^T T_{13}(y)^T \\ &+ \int_0^y Y_{q(0,\beta,d)}(z,x)^T T_{33} Y_{q(0,\beta,d)}(z,y) dz \\ &+ \int_y^x Y_{q(0,\beta,d)}(z,x)^T T_{23}^T Y_{q(0,\beta,d)}(z,y) dz \\ &+ \int_x^1 Y_{q(0,\beta,d)}(z,x)^T T_{22} Y_{q(0,\beta,d)}(z,x) dz. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

for any $T_{12}, T_{13} \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta \times q(0,\beta,d)}[x]$, $T_{22}, T_{33} \in \mathbb{S}^{q(0,\beta,d)}$ and $T_{23} \in \mathbb{R}^{q(0,\beta,d) \times q(0,\beta,d)}$, which also define

$$T(x) = \begin{bmatrix} T_b(x) & T_{12}(x) & T_{13}(x) \\ T_{12}(x)^T & T_{22} & T_{23} \\ T_{13}(x)^T & T_{23}^T & T_{33} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{S}^{\beta+2q(0,\beta,d)}[x]. \tag{26}$$

Corollary 1: Given (polynomial) matrices which define $\mathcal{T}(w)$ in (24) If there exists a positive scalar ϵ such that

$$T(x) - \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon I_\beta & 0_{\beta,2q(0,\beta,d)} \\ 0_{2q(0,\beta,d),\beta} & 0_{2q(0,\beta,d)} \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \quad \forall x \in [0,1], \tag{27}$$

where $T(x)$ is defined in (26), then,

$$\mathcal{T}(w) \geq \epsilon \|w\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{L}_2([0,1]). \tag{28}$$

Proof: Following the same steps as for the proof of Theorem 2, it can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{T}(w) - \epsilon \|w\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} \\ &= \int_0^1 f(x)^T \left(T(x) - \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon I_\beta & 0_{\beta,2q(0,\beta,d)} \\ 0_{2q(0,\beta,d),\beta} & 0_{2q(0,\beta,d)} \end{bmatrix} \right) f(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$f(x) = \begin{bmatrix} w(x) \\ \int_0^x Y_{q(0,\beta,d)}(x,y) w(y) dy \\ \int_x^1 Y_{q(0,\beta,d)}(x,y) w(y) dy \end{bmatrix}, \quad w \in \mathcal{L}_2([0,1]).$$

Then, (28) holds since (27) holds. ∎

IV. SLACK INTEGRALS

In Section II we cast the stability of (2) as a test of positivity and non-negativity of integral inequalities in (9) and (10). In Section V we will show that Corollary 1 is sufficient to verify (9). However, Theorem 2 is not sufficient to verify (10) since this theorem allows us to test $\mathcal{V}_d(w) \geq 0$ on $\mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1])$ and not on $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1])$ only. As discussed in Section II, to solve this problem we construct slack integrals $\mathcal{S}(w)$ which we defined as integral expressions with the same structure as $\mathcal{V}_d(w)$ and satisfies

$$\mathcal{S}(w) = 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{B}. \tag{29}$$

Then, we may use Theorem 2 to test if

$$\mathcal{V}_d(w) + \mathcal{S}(w) \geq 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1]),$$

which, if true, would imply that

$$\mathcal{V}_d(w) \geq 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{B},$$

owing to (29).

We will construct slack integrals using quadratic forms of the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus (FTC) and Green's theorem.

Lemma 1 (FTC quadratic form): For any $K_1 \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta\alpha\times\beta\alpha}[x]$ and $K_2 \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta\alpha\times 2\beta\alpha}[x]$ the following identity holds

$$\int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T He\left(K_b(x)\right)\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx = 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1]), \tag{30}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
K_b =& \begin{bmatrix} K_{b1}(x) & K_{b2}(x) \\ 0_{2\beta\alpha,\beta(\alpha+1)} & K_{b3} \end{bmatrix},\\
K_{b1}(x) =& N^T\partial_x K_1(x)N + N^T K_1(x)N_\partial + N_\partial^T K_1(x)N,\\
K_{b2}(x) =& N_\partial^T K_2(x) + N^T\partial_x K_2(x),\\
K_{b3} =& N_0^T K_1(0)N_0 - N_1^T K_1(1)N_1 + N_0K_2(0) - N_1K_2(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof: The identity (30) is established by developing

$$\int_0^1 \frac{d}{dx}g(x)dx - (g(1) - g(0)) = 0,$$

with

$$g(x) = w_{\alpha-1}(x)^T K_1(x)w_{\alpha-1}(x) + w_{\alpha-1}(x)^T K_2(x)w_\alpha^b.$$

■

Next, we present the quadratic form of the Green's theorem. The proof of the following lemma is provided in the Appendix.

Lemma 2 (Green's theorem quadratic form): For any $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta\alpha\times\beta\alpha}[(x,y)]$, the following identity holds

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T He\left(H_b(x)\right)\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx\\
&+ \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T\Gamma\left[\bar{H}\right]w_\alpha(y)d\Delta = 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1]),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
H_b(x) =& \begin{bmatrix} H_{b1}(x) & H_{b2}(x) \\ H_{b3}(x) & 0_{2\beta\alpha} \end{bmatrix},\\
H_{b1}(x) =& -N^T\left(H_1(x,x) + H_2(x,x)\right)N,\\
H_{b2}(x) =& N^T H_1(x,0)N_0, \quad H_{b3}(x) = N_1^T H_2(1,x)N,\\
\bar{H}(x,y) =& \frac{1}{2}N^T\left(\partial_y H_1(x,y) - \partial_x H_2(x,y)\right)N\\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\left(N^T H_1(x,y)N_\partial - N_\partial^T H_2(x,y)N\right).
\end{aligned}$$

In the following lemma we formulate an integral equation that holds on the set $\mathcal{B}$ given in (2b). The proof of this lemma is provided in the Appendix.

Lemma 3: Given $F_1 \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta\alpha\times\beta(\alpha+1)}[x]$ and $F_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\beta\alpha\times 2\beta\alpha}$ the following identity holds true for all $w \in \mathcal{B}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T He\left(B_b(x)\right)\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx\\
&+ \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T\Gamma\left[\bar{B}\right]w_\alpha(y)d\Delta = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
B_b(x) =& \begin{bmatrix} 0_{\beta(\alpha+1)} & B_1(x)F_2 \\ B_2F_1(x) & B_2F_2 \end{bmatrix},\\
\bar{B}(x,y) =& \frac{1}{2}\left(B_1(x)F_1(y) + F_1(x)^T B_1(y)^T\right),
\end{aligned}$$

for any $B_1 \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta(\alpha+1)\times\beta\alpha}[x]$ and $B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{2\beta\alpha\times\beta\alpha}$.

We now use the results in Lemmas 1-3 to formulate slack integrals on the set $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1])$.

Let us define

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}(w) =& \int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T He\left(K_b(x) + H_b(x) + B_b(x)\right)\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx\\
&+ \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T\Gamma\left[\bar{H} + \bar{B}\right]w_\alpha(y)d\Delta,
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where K_b is parameterized by K_1 and K_2 as in Lemma 1, H_b and $\bar{H}$ are parameterized by H_1 and H_2 as in Lemma 2 and B_b and $\bar{B}$ are parameterized by B_1 and B_2 and the (polynomial) matrices F_1 and F_2 which define the set $\mathcal{B}$ as in Lemma 3.

We now state the main result of this section.

Theorem 3: Given (polynomial) matrices $F_1(x)$ and F_2 which define the set $\mathcal{B}$ in (2b), the following identity holds true

$$\mathcal{S}(w) = 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{B}, \tag{32}$$

where $\mathcal{S}(w)$ is parameterized by any K_i, H_i and B_i, $i \in \{1,2\}$, as in in (31).

Proof: We begin by considering the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}(w) =& \int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T He\left(K_b(x) + H_b(x) + B_b(x)\right)\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx\\
&+ \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T\Gamma\left[\bar{H} + \bar{B}\right]w_\alpha(y)d\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^3 \Theta_i,
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Theta_1 =& \int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T He\left(K_b(x)\right)\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx,\\
\Theta_2 =& \int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T He\left(H_b(x)\right)\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx\\
&+ \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T\Gamma\left[\bar{H}\right]w_\alpha(y)d\Delta,\\
\Theta_3 =& \int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T He\left(B_b(x)\right)\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx\\
&+ \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T\Gamma\left[\bar{B}\right]w_\alpha(y)d\Delta.
\end{aligned}$$

From Lemmas 1 and 2 we have that

$$\Theta_1 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_2 = 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1]). \tag{34}$$

From Lemma 3 we have that

$$\Theta_3 = 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{B}. \tag{35}$$

Therefore, from (33)-(35) we conclude that the expression in (32) holds for all $w \in \mathcal{B}$. ■

V. MAIN RESULT

In this section we use the results formulated in Sections III-IV to construct a method of verifying the stability of PDE (2).

Let us proceed with the following.

Theorem 4: Consider the PDE (2). For any given $d \in \mathbb{N}$, positive scalars ϵ, δ and polynomial $Y_{q(\alpha,\beta,d)} \in \mathcal{R}^{q(\alpha,\beta,d)\times\beta(\alpha+1)}[(x,y)]$ defined in (1), suppose there exist:

$$\text{(polynomial) matrices defining } \mathcal{R}(w) \text{ in (14)}, \tag{36a}$$

$$\text{(polynomial) matrices defining } \mathcal{T}(w) \text{ in (24)}, \tag{36b}$$

$$S_T \in \mathcal{S}^{\beta+2q(0,\beta,d)}[x], \quad S_R \in \mathcal{S}^{\beta(3\alpha+1)+2q(\alpha,\beta,d)}[x], \tag{36c}$$

$$K_1 \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta\alpha\times\beta\alpha}[x], \quad K_2 \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta\alpha\times 2\beta\alpha}[x], \tag{36d}$$

$$H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta\alpha\times\beta\alpha}[(x,y)], \quad S \in \mathcal{S}^{\beta(3\alpha+1)}[x], \tag{36e}$$

$$B_1 \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta(\alpha+1)\times\beta\alpha}[x], \quad B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{2\beta\alpha\times\beta\alpha}, \tag{36f}$$

such that

$$T(x) - \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon I_\beta & 0_{\beta,2q(0,\beta,d)} \\ 0_{2q(0,\beta,d),\beta} & 0_{2q(0,\beta,d)} \end{bmatrix} - S_T(x)\omega(x) \in \Sigma^{\beta+2q(0,\beta,d)}[x], \tag{37a}$$

$$S_T \in \Sigma^{\beta+2q(0,\beta,d)}[x], \tag{37b}$$

$$R(x) - S_R(x)\omega(x) \in \Sigma^{\beta(3\alpha+1)+2q(\alpha,\beta,d)}[x], \tag{37c}$$

$$S_R(x) \in \Sigma^{\beta(3\alpha+1)+2q(\alpha,\beta,d)}[x], \tag{37d}$$

$$He\left(U_b(x) + K_b(x) + H_b(x) + B_b(x)\right) - R_b(x) - S(x)\omega(x) \in \Sigma^{\beta(3\alpha+1)}[x], \tag{37e}$$

$$S(x) \in \Sigma^{\beta(3\alpha+1)}[x], \tag{37f}$$

$$\bar{U}(x,y) + \bar{H}(x,y) + \bar{B}(x,y) - \bar{R}(x,y) = 0_{\alpha+1}, \tag{37g}$$

where $\omega(x) = x(1-x)$, $T(x)$ and $R(x)$ are defined in (26) and (16), respectively, K_b is defined using K_i as in Lemma 1, H_b and $\bar{H}$ are defined using H_i as in Lemma 2, B_b and $\bar{B}$ are defined using B_i and F_i as in Lemma 3 and polynomials U_b and $\bar{U}$ are defined in (8) with T_b and $\bar{T}$ defined in (24).

Then, (2) is exponentially stable.

Proof: Since the polynomial matrix in (37a) is Sum-of-Squares (SOS), S_T is SOS and $\omega(x) \geq 0$, for all $x \in [0,1]$, using the property that a SOS polynomial is non-negative for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we conclude that $T(x)$ satisfies (27). Therefore, $\mathcal{T}(w) \geq \epsilon\|w\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}$, for all $w \in \mathcal{L}_2([0,1])$. Moreover, from (6) we have that $\mathcal{V}(w) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{T}(w)$ and thus

$$\mathcal{V}(w) \geq \mu\|w\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{L}_2([0,1]), \tag{38}$$

with $\mu = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$. Similarly, since (37c)-(37d) holds, we conclude from Theorem 2 that

$$\mathcal{R}(w) \geq 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1]), \tag{39}$$

where $\mathcal{R}(w)$ is defined in (18).

Now, let us define

$$\mathcal{P}(w) = \int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T P_b(x)\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx + \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T \Gamma\left[\bar{P}\right] w_\alpha(y)\Delta, \tag{40}$$

where

$$P_b(x) = He\left(U_b(x) + K_b(x) + H_b(x) + B_b(x)\right) - R_b(x),$$
$$\bar{P}(x,y) = \bar{U}(x,y) + \bar{H}(x,y) + \bar{B}(x,y) - \bar{R}(x,y).$$

Now, since (37e)-(37g) holds, we deduce that

$$P_b(x) \succeq 0, \quad \forall x \in [0,1],$$

$$\bar{P}(x,y) = 0, \quad \forall (x,y) \in \Delta.$$

Therefore, we get

$$\mathcal{P}(w) \geq 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1]). \tag{41}$$

From the definition of $\mathcal{P}(w)$ in (40) it is clear that

$$\mathcal{P}(w) = \mathcal{V}_d(w) + \mathcal{S}(w) - \mathcal{R}(w),$$

where $\mathcal{V}_d(w)$ is defined in (8) and $\mathcal{S}(w)$ is defined in (31). Thus, using (41) we obtain

$$\mathcal{V}_d(w) + \mathcal{S}(w) - \mathcal{R}(w) \geq 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1]).$$

Using (39) the previous expression may be reduced to

$$\mathcal{V}_d(w) + \mathcal{S}(w) \geq 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1]). \tag{42}$$

Now, from Theorem 3 we have that $\mathcal{S}(w) = 0$, for all $w \in \mathcal{B}$, thus, from (42) we deduce that

$$\mathcal{V}_d(w) \geq 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1]). \tag{43}$$

Since (38) and (43) hold, we apply Theorem 1 to complete the proof. ■

Since polynomials are closed under differentiation and integration, we have that K_b and $\bar{H}$ containing $\partial_x K_1(x)$, $\partial_x K_2(x)$, $\partial_y H_1(x,y)$ and $\partial_x H_2(x,y)$ in Lemmas 1-2 are polynomials. Moreover, since the polynomial $Y_{q(\alpha,\beta,d)}(x,y)$ is fixed, the terms R_b, $\bar{R}$, T_b and $\bar{T}$ in Theorem 2 and Corollary 1 are polynomials affine in their respective (polynomial) matrices. Therefore, the conditions in (37) are simply either, 1) a verification of the membership of polynomial matrices in the set of SOS polynomials as in (37a)-(37f), or, 2) enforcement of affine constraints on the polynomial variables as in (37g). Indeed, the problem of searching for SOS polynomials subject to affine constraints is a Semi-Definite Program (SDP), [1, Chapter 3], [17], a convex optimization problem that is cast as

SDP Problem: Find (36) subject to (37). (44)

The numerical implementation is performed by constructing the underlying SDP for (44) by using the freely available packages SOSTOOLS [13] or YALMIP [9]. Then, the associated SDP is solved, for example, using SeDuMi [14] or SDPA [19] solvers.

A. Numerical Examples

We now determine the stability of PDEs (3), (4) and (5) provided in Section II by solving the problem in (44) for each of these systems. Recall that each of these systems are parameterized by a positive scalar $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. The parameter λ can alter the stability properties of these systems, and thus, allows us to measure the effectiveness of the proposed methodology.

We run the numerical codes for the example PDEs with $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$, $\delta = 10^{-4}$ and maximum polynomial degree of 8: a limit imposed by the memory resources of 8 giga bytes of RAM. In the following example, we search for the maximum $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ for which the conditions of problem (44) are feasible using a bisection search with a resolution of 10^{-3}.

Example 1*:* Recall that the parabolic PDE with boundary feedback in (3) can be written in the form of (2) with $\alpha = 2, \beta = 1$ and

$$w(x,t) = v(x,t),$$
$$A(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 0.5x & x^2+1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad F_1(x) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x^2-x & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$
$$F_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using finite-differences solutions we approximate that this system is stable for $\lambda <\approx 3.792$. The maximum λ for which the problem (44) is feasible is $\lambda = 3.760$ which is 99.14% of the value of 3.792 obtained via the finite-difference approximation.

Example 2*:* We recall that the coupled first order hyperbolic PDE in (4) can be written in the form of (2) with $\alpha = 1, \beta = 2$ and

$$w(x,t) = \begin{bmatrix} v_1(x,t) & v_2(x,t) \end{bmatrix}^T,$$
$$A(x) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x-3 & (\lambda-1)\left(x^2+1\right) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & x+1 \end{bmatrix},$$
$$F_1(x) = 0_{\beta\alpha,\beta(\alpha+1)}, \quad F_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & -3 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using [4, Lemma 3.1] it can be established that this PDE is exponentially stable for $\lambda < 1$. The maximum λ for which problem (44) is feasible is $\lambda = 0.999$ which is 99.9% of the stability value of 1.

Example 3*:* Finally, recall the Euler-Bernoulli beam model in (5) represented with with $\alpha = 2, \beta = 2$ and

$$w(x,t) = \begin{bmatrix} \partial_x^2 v(x,t) & \partial_t v(x,t) \end{bmatrix}^T,$$
$$A(x) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad F_1(x) = 0_{\beta\alpha,\beta(\alpha+1)},$$
$$F_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{1-\lambda} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1-\lambda & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This PDE is stable for $\lambda < 1$ (see [8, Exercise 8.3]).The maximum λ for which problem (44) is feasible is $\lambda = 0.998$ which is 99.8% of the stability value of 1.

Note that our method successfully establishes the stability of the example PDEs within 99% of the approximated/analytic stability margin for λ. However, there is slight relative lack of ability in establishing the stability of Example 1 as compared to Examples 2 and 3. A reason for this could be the approximate nature of finite-differences method which we apply to approximate the stability margin λ for Example 1. Moreover, as we argued in [6], the presented method should perform better as the degree of polynomial variables is increased. However, the maximum degree which we can consider, as discussed previously, is limited by the memory available.

VI. CONCLUSION

We presented a method to verify stability for a large class of 1-D PDEs with polynomial data. The presented methodology relies on using the Lyapunov's method to reduce the problem of stability to the verification of integral inequalities. An application of the fundamental theorem of calculus and Green's theorem, allows us to formulate a polynomial problem for verifying the integral inequalities. Using the properties of SOS polynomials allowed us to solve the polynomial problem in a computationally efficient manner by casting the problem as an SDP. The numerical experiments indicate that the method can predict the stability of the systems considered up to a high degree of accuracy. We would like to extend this method to consider an even larger class of PDEs, for example, by including Partial (Integro)-Differential Equations (P(I)DEs). Furthermore, we would like to formulate this theory for general PDEs, i.e., PDEs not constrained to have polynomial data.

APPENDIX

In the Appendix we show how $\mathcal{V}_d$ is cast as (8) and we provide the proofs of Lemmas 2 and 3.

The following Lemma is used throughout the exposition.

Lemma A.1: For any bivariate matrices $K_1(x,y), K_2(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{\beta(\alpha+1)\times\beta(\alpha+1)}$, the following identity holds

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^1 \int_0^x w_\alpha(x)^T K_1(x,y) w_\alpha(y) dy dx \\
&+ \int_0^1 \int_x^1 w_\alpha(x)^T K_2(x,y) w_\alpha(y) dy dx \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T \Gamma \left(K_1(x,y) + K_2(y,x)^T \right) w_\alpha(y) d\Delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof: We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^1 \int_0^x w_\alpha(x)^T K_1(x,y) w_\alpha(y) dy dx \\
&= \int_0^1 \int_0^x w_\alpha(y)^T K_1(x,y)^T w_\alpha(x) dy dx \\
&= \int_0^1 \int_y^1 w_\alpha(y)^T K_1(x,y)^T w_\alpha(x) dx dy \\
&= \int_0^1 \int_x^1 w_\alpha(x)^T K_1(y,x)^T w_\alpha(y) dy dx,
\end{aligned}$$

where we first transposed the integrand, followed by a change of order of integration and finally switched between the variables x and y. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^1 \int_0^x w_\alpha(x)^T K_1(x,y) w_\alpha(y) dy dx \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \int_0^x w_\alpha(x)^T K_1(x,y) w_\alpha(y) dy dx \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \int_x^1 w_\alpha(x)^T K_1(y,x)^T w_\alpha(y) dy dx \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T \Gamma \left(K_1(x,y) \right) w_\alpha(y) d\Delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Following the same steps for

$$\int_0^1 \int_x^1 w_\alpha(x)^T K_2(x,y) w_\alpha(y) dy dx,$$

then completes the proof. ∎

We now show how (8) is formulated. We begin by writing the integral expression in (6) as[1]

$$\mathcal{V}(w) = \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \Xi w, w \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}_2}, \tag{45}$$

where the self-adjoint operator Ξ on $\mathcal{L}_2([0,1])$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\Xi w\right)(x) =& T_b(x) w(x) + \int_0^x \bar{T}(x,y) w(y) dy \\
&+ \int_x^1 \bar{T}(y,x)^T w(y) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the operator Ξ is self-adjoint, we may use (2) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \mathcal{V}(w) =& \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \Xi \partial_t w, w \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}_2} + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \Xi w, \partial_t w \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}_2} \\
=& \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \Xi w, \partial_t w \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}_2} + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \Xi w, \partial_t w \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}_2} \\
=& \left\langle \Xi w, \partial_t w \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}_2} \\
=& \int_0^1 \left(T_b(x) w(x) dx + \int_0^x \bar{T}(x,y) w(y) dy \right. \\
&\left. + \int_x^1 \bar{T}(y,x)^T w(y) dy \right)^T A(x) w_\alpha(x) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

[1]For brevity we have dropped the temporal dependency of w.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V}_d(w) =& -\partial_t \mathcal{V}(w) - 2\delta \mathcal{V}(w)\\ =& -\int_0^1 \left(T_b(x)w(x)dx + \int_0^x \bar{T}(x,y)w(y)dy \right.\\ &\left. + \int_x^1 \bar{T}(y,x)^T w(y)dy\right)^T A(x)w_\alpha(x)dx\\ &- \delta\int_0^1 w(x)^T T_b(x)w(x)dx\\ &- \delta\int_\Delta w(x)^T\Gamma\left[\bar{T}(x,y)\right]w(y)d\Delta\\ =& -\Phi_1 - \Phi_2, \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_1 =& \int_0^1 \left(T_b(x)w(x) + \int_0^x \bar{T}(x,y)w(y)dy \right.\\ &\left. + \int_x^1 \bar{T}(y,x)^T w(y)dy\right)^T A(x)w_\alpha(x)dx,\\ \Phi_2 =& \delta\int_0^1 w(x)^T T_b(x)w(x)dx\\ &+ \delta\int_\Delta w(x)^T\Gamma\left[\bar{T}(x,y)\right]w(y)d\Delta.\end{aligned}$$

The term Φ_1 may be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_1 =& \int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T \begin{bmatrix} T_b(x)A(x) & 0_{\beta,2\beta\alpha}\\ 0_{3\beta\alpha,\beta(\alpha+1)} & 0_{3\beta\alpha,2\beta\alpha}\end{bmatrix}\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx\\ &+ \int_0^1\int_0^x w_\alpha(x)^T\begin{bmatrix}\bar{T}(x,y)^T A(x)\\ 0_{\beta\alpha,\beta(\alpha+1)}\end{bmatrix}^T w_\alpha(y)dydx\\ &+ \int_0^1\int_x^1 w_\alpha(x)^T\begin{bmatrix}\bar{T}(y,x)^T A(x)\\ 0_{\beta\alpha,\beta(\alpha+1)}\end{bmatrix}^T w_\alpha(y)dydx,\end{aligned}$$

where we have transposed the two double integrals. Then, applying Lemma A.1 to the double integrals and writing the single integral kernel in a symmetric form produces

$$\begin{aligned}&\Phi_1 =\\ &\int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T He\left(\begin{bmatrix} T_b(x)A(x) & 0_{\beta,2\beta\alpha}\\ 0_{3\beta\alpha,\beta(\alpha+1)} & 0_{3\beta\alpha,2\beta\alpha}\end{bmatrix}\right)\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx\\ &+\int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T\Gamma\left[\frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix}\bar{T}(x,y)^T A(x)\\ 0_{\beta\alpha,\beta(\alpha+1)}\end{bmatrix}^T\right.\\ &\qquad\left.+\frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix}\bar{T}(x,y)A(y)\\ 0_{\beta\alpha,\beta(\alpha+1)}\end{bmatrix}\right]w_\alpha(y)d\Delta.\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

The term Φ_2 may be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_2 =& \int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T He\left(\begin{bmatrix}\delta T_b(x) & 0_{\beta,3\beta\alpha}\\ 0_{3\beta\alpha,\beta} & 0_{3\beta\alpha}\end{bmatrix}\right)\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx\\ &+\frac{1}{2}\int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T\Gamma\left[\begin{bmatrix}2\delta\bar{T}(x,y) & 0_{\beta,\beta\alpha}\\ 0_{\beta\alpha,\beta} & 0_{\beta\alpha}\end{bmatrix}\right]w_\alpha(y)d\Delta.\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Substituting (47) and (48) into (46) gives (8).

We now provide the proofs of Lemmas 2 and 3.

Proof: [Proof of Lemma 2] Consider the vector field

$$\begin{bmatrix}\phi_1(x,y)\\ \phi_2(x,y)\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}w_{\alpha-1}(x)^T H_1(x,y)w_{\alpha-1}(y)\\ w_{\alpha-1}(x)^T H_2(x,y)w_{\alpha-1}(y)\end{bmatrix},$$

Then, by Green's theorem

$$\begin{aligned}&\oint_{\partial\overline{\Omega}}(\phi_1(x,y)dx + \phi_2(x,y)dy)\\ &\quad+\int_{\overline{\Omega}}(\partial_y\phi_1(x,y) - \partial_x\phi_2(x,y))\,d\overline{\Omega} = 0,\end{aligned}$$

where $\partial\overline{\Omega}$ denotes the boundary of the domain $\overline{\Omega}$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^1\left[\phi_1(x,0) + \phi_2(1,x) - \phi_1(x,x) - \phi_2(x,x)\right]dx\\ &+\int_0^1\int_0^x\left[\partial_y\phi_1 - \partial_x\phi_2\right]dydx = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Using the definitions of the projection matrices described in Section I-C, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^1\left[\phi_1(x,0) + \phi_2(1,x) - \phi_1(x,x) - \phi_2(x,x)\right]dx\\ &=\int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T H_b(x)\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx\\ &=\int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T He\left(H_b(x)\right)\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx.\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Similarly, we also obtain the following identity

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^1\int_0^x\left[\partial_y\phi_1(x,y) - \partial_x\phi_2(x,y)\right]dydx\\ &=\int_0^1\int_0^x w_\alpha(x)^T 2\bar{H}(x,y)w_\alpha(y)dydx.\end{aligned}$$

Then, applying Lemma A.1 with $K_1 = 2\bar{H}$ and $K_2 = 0$ produces

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^1\int_0^x w_\alpha(x)^T 2\bar{H}(x,y)w_\alpha(y)dydx\\ &\qquad=\int_\Delta w_\alpha(x)^T\Gamma\left[\bar{H}(x,y)\right]w_\alpha(y)dydx.\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Substituting (50) and (51) into (49) completes the proof. ■

Proof: [Proof of Lemma 3] Since for all $w \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$\int_0^1\begin{bmatrix}F_1(x) & F_2\end{bmatrix}\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx = 0_{\beta\alpha,1},$$

we get for all $w \in \mathcal{B}$

$$\begin{aligned}0 =& \int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(y)^T\begin{bmatrix}B_1(y)\\ B_2\end{bmatrix}dy\cdot\int_0^1\begin{bmatrix}F_1(x) & F_2\end{bmatrix}\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx\\ =&\int_0^1\int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(y)^T\begin{bmatrix}B_1(y)\\ B_2\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}F_1(x) & F_2\end{bmatrix}\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dydx\\ =&\int_0^1\int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(y)^T\begin{bmatrix}B_1(y)F_1(x) & B_1(y)F_2\\ B_2F_1(x) & B_2F_2\end{bmatrix}\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dydx.\end{aligned}$$

Switching between the variables x and y and changing the order of integration produces

$$0 =\int_0^1\int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T\begin{bmatrix}B_1(x)F_1(y) & B_1(x)F_2\\ B_2F_1(y) & B_2F_2\end{bmatrix}\bar{w}_\alpha(y)dydx,$$

for all $w \in \mathcal{B}$. Recall that

$$\bar{w}_\alpha(x) = \begin{bmatrix}w_\alpha(x)\\ w_\alpha^b\end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, we simplify the previous expression to obtain for all $w \in \mathcal{B}$

$$\begin{aligned}0 =& \int_0^1\int_0^1\begin{bmatrix}w_\alpha(x)\\ w_\alpha^b\end{bmatrix}^T\begin{bmatrix}B_1(x)F_1(y) & B_1(x)F_2\\ B_2F_1(y) & B_2F_2\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}w_\alpha(y)\\ w_\alpha^b\end{bmatrix}dydx\\ =&\int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T B_b(x)\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx\\ &+\int_0^1\int_0^1 w_\alpha(x)^T B_1(x)F_1(y)w_\alpha(y)dydx.\end{aligned}$$

Writing the single integral kernel in symmetric form and dividing up the double integral gives us

$$\begin{aligned}0 =& \int_0^1 \bar{w}_\alpha(x)^T He\left(B_b(x)\right)\bar{w}_\alpha(x)dx\\ &+\int_0^1\int_0^x w_\alpha(x)^T B_1(x)F_1(y)w_\alpha(y)dydx\\ &+\int_0^1\int_x^1 w_\alpha(x)^T B_1(x)F_1(y)w_\alpha(y)dydx,\end{aligned}$$

for all $w \in \mathcal{B}$. Then, applying Lemma A.1 with $K_1(x,y) = K_2(x,y) = B_1(x)F_1(y)$ completes the proof. ∎

Finally, we provide the following result which we will use in the proof of Theorem 2 and Corollary 1.

Lemma A.2: For any $v \in \mathcal{L}_2([0,1])$ and polynomial matrices $F_1, F_2, G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta\times\beta}[x,y]$, the following identity holds

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^1\left(\int_0^x F_1(x,y)v(y)dy+\int_x^1 F_2(x,y)v(y)dy\right)^T\\ &\times\left(\int_0^x G_1(x,y)v(y)dy+\int_x^1 G_2(x,y)v(y)dy\right)dx\\ &=\frac{1}{2}\int_\Delta v(x)^T\Gamma\left[K\right]v(y)d\Delta,\end{aligned}\tag{52}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}&K(x,y)\\ &=\int_0^y\left(F_2(z,x)^TG_2(z,y)+G_2(z,x)^TF_2(z,y)\right)dz\\ &+\int_y^x\left(F_2(z,x)^TG_1(z,y)+G_2(z,x)^TF_1(z,y)\right)dz\\ &+\int_x^1\left(F_1(z,x)^TG_1(z,y)+G_1(z,x)^TF_1(z,y)\right)dz.\end{aligned}$$

The same result holds for any $v \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha([0,1])$, $F_1, F_2, G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{R}^{\beta(\alpha+1)\times\beta(\alpha+1)}[x,y]$ and $v(x)$ replaced by $v_\alpha(x)$ in (52).

Proof: We begin by observing that the left hand side of (52) may be written as

$$\langle\mathcal{F}v,\mathcal{G}v\rangle=\langle v,\mathcal{F}^\star\mathcal{G}v\rangle,\tag{53}$$

where the linear bounded operators on $\mathcal{L}_2([0,1])$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\mathcal{F}v\right)(x)&=\int_0^x F_1(x,y)v(y)dy+\int_x^1 F_2(x,y)v(y)dy,\\ \left(\mathcal{G}v\right)(x)&=\int_0^x G_1(x,y)v(y)dy+\int_x^1 G_2(x,y)v(y)dy,\end{aligned}$$

and where the adjoint operator is given by

$$\left(\mathcal{F}^\star v\right)(x)=\int_0^x F_2(y,x)^Tv(y)dy+\int_x^1 F_1(y,x)^Tv(y)dy.$$

Now, using the fact that

$$\left(\mathcal{G}v\right)(y)=\int_0^y G_1(y,z)v(z)dz+\int_x^1 G_2(y,z)v(z)dz,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\mathcal{F}^\star\mathcal{G}v\right)(x)=&\int_0^x F_2(y,x)^T\left(\mathcal{G}v\right)(y)dy\\ &+\int_x^1 F_1(y,x)^T\left(\mathcal{G}v\right)(y)dy\\ =&\sum_{i=1}^4\Theta_i(x),\end{aligned}\tag{54}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_1(x)&=\int_0^x\int_0^y F_2(y,x)^TG_1(y,z)v(z)dzdy,\\ \Theta_2(x)&=\int_0^x\int_y^1 F_2(y,x)^TG_2(y,z)v(z)dzdy,\\ \Theta_3(x)&=\int_x^1\int_0^y F_1(y,x)^TG_1(y,z)v(z)dzdy,\\ \Theta_4(x)&=\int_x^1\int_y^1 F_1(y,x)^TG_2(y,z)v(z)dzdy.\end{aligned}$$

In each of the $\Theta_i(x)$ we change the order of integration and switch between the variables y and z to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_1(x)&=\int_0^x\int_y^x F_2(z,x)^TG_1(z,y)dzv(y)dy,\\ \Theta_2(x)&=\int_0^x\int_0^y F_2(z,x)^TG_2(z,y)dzv(y)dz\\ &\quad+\int_x^1\int_0^x F_2(z,x)^TG_2(z,y)dzv(y)dy,\\ \Theta_3(x)&=\int_0^x\int_x^1 F_1(z,x)^TG_1(z,y)dzv(y)dy\\ &\quad+\int_x^1\int_y^1 F_1(z,x)^TG_1(z,y)dzv(y)dy,\\ \Theta_4(x)&=\int_x^1\int_x^y F_1(z,x)^TG_2(z,y)dzv(y)dz.\end{aligned}$$

Substituting into (54) and consequently in (52) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\mathcal{F}v,\mathcal{G}v\rangle=&\int_0^1\int_0^x v(x)K_1(x,y)v(y)dydx\\ &+\int_0^1\int_x^1 v(x)K_2(x,y)v(y)dydx,\end{aligned}\tag{55}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}K_1(x,y)=&\int_0^y F_2(z,x)^TG_2(z,y)dz\\ &+\int_y^x F_2(z,x)^TG_1(z,y)dz\\ &+\int_x^1 F_1(z,x)^TG_1(z,y)dz,\\ K_2(x,y)=&\int_0^x F_2(z,x)^TG_2(z,y)dz\\ &+\int_x^y F_1(z,x)^TG_2(z,y)dz\\ &+\int_y^1 F_1(z,x)^TG_1(z,y)dz.\end{aligned}$$

Then, applying Lemma A.1 to (55) completes the proof. ∎

REFERENCES

[1] G. Blekherman, P. A Parrilo, and R. Thomas. *Semidefinite optimization and convex algebraic geometry*. SIAM, 2012.

[2] D. Bošković and M. Krstic. Stabilization of a solid propellant rocket instability by state feedback. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 13:483–495, 2003.

[3] R. Datko. Extending a theorem of A. M. Liapunov to Hilbert space. *Journal of Mathematical analysis and applications*, 32:610–616, 1970.

[4] F. Di Meglio, R. Vazquez, and M. Krstic. Stabilization of a system of $n+1$ coupled first-order hyperbolic linear PDEs with a single boundary input. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58:3097–3111, 2013.

[5] N. El-Farra, A. Armaou, and P. Christofides. Analysis and control of parabolic PDE systems with input constraints. *Automatica*, 39:715–725, 2003.

[6] A. Gahlawat and M. Peet. A convex sum-of-squares approach to analysis, state feedback and output feedback control of parabolic PDEs. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2016.

[7] P. Goulart and S. Chernyshenko. Global stability analysis of fluid flows using sum-of-squares. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 241:692–704, 2012.

[8] M. Krstic and A. Smyshlyaev. *Boundary control of PDEs: A course on backstepping designs*, volume 16. SIAM, 2008.

[9] J. Lofberg. YALMIP: A toolbox for modeling and optimization in MATLAB. In *IEEE International Symposium on Computer Aided Control Systems Design*, pages 284–289, 2005.

[10] A. Movchan. The direct method of Liapunov in stability problems of elastic systems. *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics*, 23:686–700, 1959.

[11] M. Peet. LMI parametrization of Lyapunov functions for infinite-dimensional systems: A framework. In *Proc. of the American Control Conference*, pages 359–366, 2014.

[12] M. Peet, A. Papachristodoulou, and S. Lall. Positive forms and stability of linear time-delay systems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 47:3237–3258, 2009.

[13] S. Prajna, A. Papachristodoulou, and P. Parrilo. Introducing sostools: A general purpose sum of squares programming solver. In *Proc. of the 41st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, volume 1, pages 741–746, 2002.

[14] J. Sturm. Using SeDuMi 1.02, a MATLAB toolbox for optimization over symmetric cones. *Optimization methods and software*, 11:625–653, 1999.

[15] G. Valmorbida, M. Ahmadi, and A. Papachristodoulou. Convex solutions to integral inequalities in two-dimensional domains. In *Proc. of the 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 7268–7273, 2015.

[16] G. Valmorbida, M. Ahmadi, and A. Papachristodoulou. Stability analysis for a class of partial differential equations via semidefinite programming. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 61:1649–1654, 2016.

[17] L. Vandenberghe and S. Boyd. Semidefinite programming. *SIAM*, 38:49–95, 1996.

[18] E. Witrant, E. Joffrin, S. Brémond, G. Giruzzi, D. Mazon, O. Barana, and P. Moreau. A control-oriented model of the current profile in tokamak plasma. *Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion*, 49:1075, 2007.

[19] M. Yamashita, K. Fujisawa, and M. Kojima. Implementation and evaluation of SDPA 6.0 (semidefinite programming algorithm 6.0). *Optimization Methods and Software*, 18:491–505, 2003.